# superfluous-receptacle

Challenge1Final

In "Challenge1Final", Kickstarter data was filtered, at client request, to determine which criteria were most common in successful campaigns as compared to unsuccessful campaigns, particularly as they related to Plays.

Pivot Tables, and corresponding Pivot Charts, were created with filters that identified all campaigns including "Plays," (a subdivision of the parent category, "Theaters"). This data was then stratified by Goal, and Date Launched, then analyzed and charted to determine their correlation with certain outcomes,i.e. successful, unsuccessful, and canceled.

The following assertions were evident through statistical analysis:

1) The most successful campaigns had a GOAL ranging between $1,000 and $5,000. Subsequently, future campaigns where "success" is determined by revenue generated compared to goal would be best suited to utilize this range for promotion. This could potentially be explained by contributors feeling compelled to donate when they feel their contribution is of significance as compared to total goal. The larger the goal, the lower the relative value the average contributor would have.

2) The most successful campaigns also had a LAUNCH DATE between May and August. Accordingly, the data suggests that future campaigns should be initiated within this date range. This phenomenon may be best explained by a recent study from Mast Mutual. They determined that "more than half of all Americans (52%) spend more money in the summer than they do during cooler parts of the year. Of those who admit to spending more during the summer, two-thirds of the 1,001 people surveyed said it's a "desire to make the most of summer that causes their spending to spike."

3)Two identifiable points where the absolute number or percentage of successful campaigns was eclipsed by unsuccessful campaigns included campaigns launched in December and those with a goal of $50,000 or more. The former could be explained by a predictable decline in discretionary income at the end of the year, partly a derivative of holiday spending. The latter might also be accounted for by the explanation provided in example one; that is, individuals may be less inclined to donate when there's a greater disparity between the amount raised and projected goal.

The following limitations are inherent to this statistical analysis, presented as additional questions of interest that exceeded the scope of this project:

1) What percentage over goal were the successful campagins and does this change correlation with the size of the goal? In other words, when donors know they're contributing to a campaign that's already over goal, does that dissuede from further contributions? If so, would creating a fluid goal that changes in response to percentage reached result in a higher gross over time? Similarly, would responsively lowering the goal increase contributions when we feel such a disparity deters contributions?

2) What percetage under goal were the unsuccessful campaigns and does this change in direct or indirect correlation with the size of the goal?

3) Was there a correlation between the time of year and gross contributions? We know that most successful campaigns happened during summer months but what were the absolute goals during those summer months? In this respect, success does not equate to worth. For example, an unsuccessful summer campaign may have raised $48,000 out of a $50,000 goal. If we strictly recommended the $1,000 to $5,000 range during this period, for the highest likelihood of success, our clients might miss out on additional fundraising opportunities unnecessarily.